



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROFESSOR SHOREY'S REJOINDER

Miss Goodale's Glance at the Lyric Vocabulary of Horace (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10.122-126) testifies to her delicate appreciation of the subtle charm of her poet. Some of her interpretations I can cordially accept as warnings against the misunderstanding or exaggeration of what I myself intended to say. But in her eagerness to score against me she does something less than justice to the fair meaning of my words in their entire context. She runs into one paragraph widely separated sentences with an indication, it is true, of omissions, but with no sufficient warning to her readers that the omitted or neglected qualifications are sometimes precisely those which she herself applies to overthrow what she supposes to be my main thesis. Thus apropos of *vagus Hercules*, she comments, "Here enters, as so often in Horace, the magic of the proper name", etc. That is both true and obvious. But on page xxiv I mention, among the compensations that relieve the parsimony of Horace's vocabulary, his use of "proper names charged with associations of mythology, history, literature, and travel", etc., for half a page of illustration and statistics.

On *vaga flumina* she comments, "Here the lump weight of *bruta* sits over against *vaga* and throws it into relief", etc. My note says, again obviously and hence briefly, "*bruta* . . . contrasted with gliding streams".

On *vagas domos* she remarks, "We have a contrast sharp enough to be called oxymoron . . . which Professor Shorey in his haste to condemn *vagus* seems quite to have missed". My note reads, briefly again, "*vagas*: not proleptic, but a poetic oxymoron with *domos*". My first amazement at this was tardily tempered by the discovery that two columns later she adds, "Professor Shorey casually recognizes, to be sure, the oxymoron with *domus*". This is what B. L. T. has taught the cultured circles of Chicago to call The Second Post or the valve-handle wheeze. He is presumably unacquainted with its frequent occurrence in philological literature, due to the reluctance of the philological mind to cancel anything that it has once set down on paper. But it is time to be serious. And yet Miss Goodale herself hardly expected us to take seriously the argument that a thin word articially placed is proved a rich word by imaginative contemplation of the consequences of its total suppression, or that a commonplace word somewhat too frequently employed by that very fact gathers to itself all the associations of all the passages in which it occurs. This postulates readers of Miss Goodale's own devoted enthusiasm. The fact seems to be that her enthusiasm for Horace calls for more than I was able to furnish of that explicit "criticism of beauties" which my Preface illustrated from M. Sarcy, and reluctantly renounced as demanding too much space.

Ecce autem a Tenedo gemini tranquilla per alta. Ecce autem! Les voilà, ce sont eux! *A Tenedo*; c'est de Ténédos qu' ils arrivent; on les aperçoit de loin;

gemini; ils sont deux; ils forment un couple! *Ambo* serait faible: mais *gemini!* *Tranquilla per alta*; c'est la haute mer; elle est tranquille, et les deux monstres s'avancent. Quel tableau!

Miss Goodale herself—I say it in all sincerity—develops this kind of criticism very well, especially, I should fancy, for class-room purposes, though in some instances, as e. g. C. 3. 27.13-16, I think fantastically.

It would then be unphilosophic in me to take umbrage at the captious scrutiny to which she subjects some of my innocent sentences. She cannot really suppose that a habit of translating as I read has made me "less apt to perceive constantly the fundamental inequation in different languages of any words save those of the commonest and most concrete application". I, of course, used 'dire' in quotation marks with malice aforethought to recall *dirus*, not to translate it. And I of course knew that *vagas*, strictly speaking, applied to the Scythians's house and not to the Scythians. But in a rapid enumeration where it practically made no difference I used the conventional English epithet nomad, and did not think it necessary to complicate the closing phrase of my sentence by painful explicitness. The ode and line reference given to the passage itself, and my note there kept my conscience clear.

To come to the real issue, my two pages on the relative poverty of Horace's poetic vocabulary and the difficulty of writing good Latin Sapphics and Alcaics have irritated not only Miss Goodale but other partisans of Horace and the Latin language. The interesting topic would supply material for a treatise, and I perhaps developed it at disproportionate length in the Introduction to a College text. But I wonder if Miss Goodale would really deny the simple truth that I was trying to illustrate as vividly as possible. *Lingua per se inops*, says Muretus somewhere. And, though the special pleading of Cicero and Munro can be cited against him, any one who will glance at the Latin translations of the Palatine Anthology will know what he meant. Horace's available poetic vocabulary was limited both by the language and the difficulty of the, for Latin, artificial meters. That his exquisite art found compensations for these restrictions was precisely my main thesis, and Miss Goodale is merely abounding in my sense when she turns this and other topics of my Introduction and my Notes against me. What did she suppose I meant by unflinching tact, exquisite felicity, inevitable, the total effect of rhythm, emphasis, and artful juncture in the original, curious felicity, the tact that selects just those names which will arouse pleasant associations, deriving effects of novelty from the cunning juncture of ordinary words, effects of economy and restraint, the employment of epithets in such a way as to suggest their complementary opposites, and similar phrases and catchwords throughout my analysis of Horace's style?

The Greek and English expressions contrasted with the vaguer Latin were of course not usually intended as critical translations. Still less were the Greek words supposed to be the originals which Horace was con-

sciously trying and failing to render. They merely illustrated a point which might be endlessly illustrated.

Miss Goodale quotes Professor Mackail, who, as is well known, prefers what he calls simplicity and restraint on principle and whose ear aches for the *vox humana* of Simonides when he reads Pindar. I hold that Horace made a virtue of necessity. Professor Mackail thinks that there was no necessity and that the virtue was embraced for its own sake. It is a pretty question. I do not deny that the resources of Horace's vocabulary extended to many words not used in the Odes. He might also, as I point out in my Introduction, instead of coining felicitous simple phrases, have experimented, as Pacuvius did, with compounds alien to the genius of the language. The poverty of which I spoke is then the poverty of the Latin language in words that could be used in the meters of the Odes with poetical effect. The tact and the art of Horace, we all agree, recognized this limitation. We need not therefore deny its existence. A similar question may be raised about a very dissimilar English poet. Swinburne is sometimes censured for verbosity and tautologous prolixity. He is verbose and prolix. But no one has ever written perfect anapests in English without paying that price.

I count myself after all these years still a lover of Horace. I cordially concur in the judgment that he constructed the best lays tribal or other that the Latin language of that date was capable of. But it was not apparently capable of the plastic wealth and freedom of the supreme Greek and English lyric. And I see no superstitious totem worship in pointing this out with illustrations intended to bring it home to the mind of the student fortunate enough to know Greek. So I repeat impudently, with the added emphasis of italics, the first sentence of my little essay on his style:

A study of Horace's style must be mainly an analysis of the *art* by which he compensates for the slenderness of his own inspiration and the *relative* poverty of the Latin lyric vocabulary.

PAUL SHOREY.

MISS GOODALE'S REPLY

I am grateful for the opportunity of rejoining to Professor Shorey's rejoinder, but I have no inclination to make any stated and formal reply. In my paper I expressed deep admiration and appreciation of Professor Shorey, but pointed out some matters in which I thought he did Horace and the Latin language less than justice. Professor Shorey expresses commendation and appreciation of me in certain matters Horatian, and points out instances in which he thinks I have done him something less than justice. I could, in turn, renew my expressed admiration of Professor Shorey, agree with some of his limitations upon my statements (limitations, some of which I had already made myself, as, for instance, that dealing with the validity of judging a word by the effect of removing it), and go on to note again matter or manner in his rejoinder which fails to

achieve ideal justice. I might, for example, diagram the fact that, when I deplored his ignoring of the oxymoron, I was dealing with his blanket indictment of *vagus* in his Introduction, an indictment not to be effectually softened by (I repeat) a casual recognition of the oxymoron in the Notes, a good deal farther away from the original indictment than my allusion to it was from my strictures on the Introduction, and less inevitably within the ken of the reader of the passage which it modifies. Of course Professor Shorey knows more about the habits of the philological mind than I do, and that mind may have a reluctance to cancel anything it has once set down on paper. I am unable to see, myself, that my recognition of the passage in the Notes implies any need to cancel what I had set down about the Introduction, in full knowledge of the passage in the Notes and with the definite intention of recognizing that passage, as I did recognize it, in due time. Surely, too, Professor Shorey does not mean to insinuate that with deep design and malice aforethought I omitted in my citations passages from which I had myself adopted material for his undoing. Of course he doesn't, any more than I meant to imply that the particular flaw of overemphasis which I seemed to find in his admired Introduction was typical of, or entirely unopposed by, the fine thing as a whole. I took it for granted that all my audience knew and delighted in that fine thing as I did, and quoted only such portions—necessarily limited by exigencies of space—as must be more vividly recalled in order to understand what I meant.

I might, as I said, go on to take up Professor Shorey's rejoinder item by item, reaffirming or explaining as the case required, inevitably inviting, I should suppose, another communication from Professor Shorey. As a communication from Professor Shorey, on any subject whatsoever, is always a boon to the literary world, whether it is couched entirely in his own inimitable phrases or gives fresh currency to such delectable fooling as the quotation from M. Sarcy, the temptation to bid for another letter might be rather strong, were it not checked by an acute realization of the limited space and wide interests of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. It would be making too extensive demands upon that generous periodical, as well as upon Professor Shorey's valuable time, to keep the pendulum swaying in ever decreasing arcs until it reached that point of equilibrium at which all sincere lovers of Horace must arrive at last, where differences in matters of detail disappear in identity of admiration and enjoyment. If I could meet Professor Shorey in person instead of in the pages of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, that point might, perhaps, be reached more expeditiously. Perhaps, too—who knows?—even that tendency to overenthusiasm might have been corrected had I been privileged to frequent what a gifted and distinguished ex-pupil of Professor Shorey has described to me as "that wonderful class-room where we became devotees".

BARNARD COLLEGE,

GRACE HARRIET GOODALE,